Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated August 18, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 17 and 20 have been amended. Claims 14 and16 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Subject matter from claim 17 has been deleted and is now recited by new dependent claim 21. No new subject matter has been added to the claims.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 8-13, 15 and 17-20 are pending and stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfleging (Pub. No. US20040064445) in view of Matsuo (Pub. No. US2003/0130857), further in of Hill (U.S. Pat. 6,029,192), and further in view of Desai (U.S. Pat. 6,820,204). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to the extent that they apply to the currently pending claims.

Claims 1-15

Independent claim 1 recites, in pertinent part:

> [a] method for retrieving information in a private database, the method comprising:
> receiving at an e-mail server, via an e-mail, a request from a wireless communication device to retrieve the information in the private database;
> upon receiving the request, the e-mail server comparing an e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, the e-mail server retrieving the information from the private database, wherein the information retrieved comprises a list of documents which are listed by order of relevance;
> sending, at the e-mail server, the information retrieved by the e-mail server to the wireless communication device; and
> if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then at the e-mail server, denying the request to retrieve the information.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of references fail to disclose each of the features recited by amended claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites "the e-mail server comparing an e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail

addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, the e-mail server retrieving the information from the private database." Thus, claim 1 recites comparing an email address against a list of e-mail addresses and retrieving requested information from a database if the e-mail is on the list.

The Office Action contends that Matsuo describes these features recited by claim 1. Matsuo describes an information exchange framework which includes a secure e-mail delivery feature. A sender addresses an e-mail with a recipient's intermediary email address. The sender's e-mail address is compared to email addresses of authorized parties. The e-mail is then forwarded on to the recipients final e-mail address if the sender's email address matches an authorized party. The forwarding of an e-mail based on a comparison as described by Matsuo is distinct from the retrieving of information if the requesting email address is on a list as recited by claim 1. Thus, Matsuo fails to disclose all of the features recited by claim 1 for a least this reason. Pfleging, Hill and Desai also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Therefore, Matsuo, in combination with Pfleging, Hill and Desai fail to disclose all of the features of claim 1 such that claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Dependent claims 2-3 and 9-15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

The combination of references also fail to disclose additional features recited by claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites "if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then at the e-mail server, denying the request to retrieve the information from the private database." The Office Action contends that this feature is described by Pfleging. Pfleging describes the receipt of a query through an e-mail message and an e-mail server making a determination if the query is valid. If the query is not valid a message is returned to the sender advising of the requirements for a query. Hence, Pfleging is describing a check for valid query syntax and denying improper queries. The denial of a query due to improper syntax is distinct from denying a request to retrieve information if an e-mail address is not on a list as recited by claim 1. Thus, Pfleging fails to disclose all of the features recited by claim 1 for a least this additional and independent reason. Matsuo, Hill and Desai also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Therefore, Pfleging, in combination with Matsuo, Hill and Desai fail to disclose all of the features of claim 1 such that claim 1 is allowable for at least this additional and independent reason. Dependent claims 2-3 and 9-15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same additional and independent reasons.

Claims 17 -19

Independent claim 17 recites:

[an] apparatus for retrieving information in a private database, the apparatus comprising:

an e-mail server accessing the private database, wherein the e-mail server is configured for communication with a wireless communication device via e-mail and includes:

an identification module at the e-mail server identifying an e-mail address of the wireless communication device; and

an authorization module at the e-mail server authorizing the e-mail server to retrieve the information and forward the information to the wireless communication device, wherein the authorization module is operative to compare the e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then the e-mail server retrieving the information from the private database, and if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then denying the request to retrieve the information.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of references fail to disclose each of the features recited by amended claim 17. For example, claim 17 recites "the authorization module is operative to compare the e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then the e-mail server retrieving the information from the private database." Thus, claim 17 recites the authorization module comparing an email address against a list of e-mail addresses and retrieving requested information from a database if the e-mail is on the list.

The Office Action contends that Matsuo describes these features recited by claim 17. Matsuo describes an information exchange framework which includes a secure e-mail delivery feature. A sender addresses an e-mail with a recipient's intermediary email address. The sender's e-mail address is compared to email addresses of authorized parties. The e-mail is then forwarded on to the recipients final e-mail address if the sender's email address matches an authorized party. The forwarding of an e-mail based on a comparison as described by Matsuo is distinct from the retrieving of information if the requesting email address is on a list as recited by claim 17. Thus, Matsuo fails to disclose all of the features recited by claim 17 for a least this reason. Pfleging, Hill and Desai also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Therefore, Matsuo, in combination with Pfleging, Hill and Desai fail to disclose all of the features of claim 17 such that claim 17 is allowable for at least this reason. Dependent claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

The combination of references also fail to disclose additional features recited by claim 17. For example, claim 17 recites "if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then at the e-mail server, denying the request to retrieve the information." The Office Action contends that this feature is described by Pfleging. Pfleging describes the receipt of a query through an e-mail message and an e-mail server making a determination if the query is valid. If the query is not valid a message is returned to the sender advising of the requirements for a query. Hence, Pfleging is describing a check for valid query syntax and denying improper queries. The denial of a query due to improper syntax is distinct from denying a request to retrieve information if an e-mail address is not on a list as recited by claim 17. Thus, Pfleging fails to disclose all of the features recited by claim 17 for a least this additional and independent reason. Matsuo, Hill and Desai also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Therefore, Pfleging, in combination with Matsuo, Hill and Desai fail to disclose all of the features of claim 17 such that claim 17 is allowable for at least this additional and independent reason. Dependent claims 18-19 depend from claim 17 and are allowable for at least the same additional and independent reasons.

Claims 20-21

Independent claim 20 recites:

> [a] computer-readable medium having stored thereon a set of instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to:
> identify an e-mail address of a wireless communication device; and
> an e-mail server to retrieve information in a private database and forward the information to the wireless communication device, wherein the processor is operative to compare the e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then retrieving the information from the private database, and if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then denying the request to access the information.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of references fail to disclose each of the features recited by amended claim 20. For example, claim 20 recites "wherein the processor is operative to compare the e-mail address identified with the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses residing at the e-mail server, and if the identified e-mail address is on the list, then retrieving the information from the private database." Thus, claim 20 recites comparing the email address of the wireless communication device against a list of e-mail addresses and retrieving requested information from the database if the e-mail is on the list.

The Office Action contends that Matsuo describes these features recited by claim 20. Matsuo describes an information exchange framework which includes a secure e-mail delivery feature. A sender addresses an e-mail with a recipient's intermediary email address. The sender's e-mail address is compared to email addresses of authorized parties. The e-mail is then forwarded on to the recipients final e-mail address if the sender's email address matches an authorized party. The forwarding of an e-mail based on a comparison as described by Matsuo is distinct from the retrieving of information if the e-mail address identified with the wireless communication devices is on a list as recited by claim 20. Thus, Matsuo fails to disclose all of the features recited by claim 20 for a least this reason. Pfleging, Hill and Desai also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Therefore, Matsuo, in combination with Pfleging, Hill and Desai fail to disclose all of the features of claim 20 such that claim 20 is allowable for at least this reason. Dependent claim 21 depends from claim 20 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

The combination of references also fail to disclose additional features recited by claim 20. For example, claim 20 recites "if the identified e-mail address is not on the list, then at the e-mail server, denying the request to retrieve the information." The Office Action contends that this feature is described by Pfleging. Pfleging describes the receipt of a query through an e-mail message and an e-mail server making a determination if the query is valid. If the query is not valid a message is returned to the sender advising of the requirements for a query. Hence, Pfleging is describing a check for valid query syntax and denying improper queries. The denial of a query due to improper syntax is distinct from denying a request to retrieve information if an e-mail address is not on a list as recited by claim 20. Thus, Pfleging fails to disclose all of the features recited by claim 20 for a least this additional and independent reason. Matsuo, Hill and Desai also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Therefore, Pfleging, in combination with Matsuo, Hill and Desai fail to disclose all of the features of claim 20 such that claim 20 is allowable for at least this additional and independent reason. Dependent claim 21 depends from claim 20 and is allowable for at least the same additional and independent reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-3, 8-13, 15 and 17-20 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 5, 2008

/Daniel J. Layden/

Daniel J. Layden
Reg. No. 60,921

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748